

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 12, 15, 19, 20, 22, 26, 31, 44 and 45 have been amended. No new matter is being presented. Therefore, claims 1-3 and 6-45 are pending and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116:

Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response because the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejections of claims 1-2, 8-9, 12-15, 19-20, 22, 26, 31 and 44-45 have been addressed and are believed to be overcome as discussed below. As such, the claims are either in condition for allowance or are, at least, in better form for appeal. Further, with respect to the recitation that the built-in main memory is detachable, it is noted that this recitation is found in line 7 of paragraph [0016] and has been well within the scope of the application. As such, the addition of the recitation should not raise new issues that require further search.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in Section 714.12 that "any amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." Moreover, Section 714.13 sets forth that "the Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:

Claims 1-2, 8-9, 12-15, 19-20, 22, 26, 31 and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. These rejections are overcome.

Briefly, it is noted that claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 12, 15, 19, 20, 22, 26, 31, and 44 have been amended in accordance with the suggestions of the Office Action. In particular, these claims now recite the main memory has a basic recording capacity and that the detachable auxiliary memory allows for an adjustment of the recording capacity of the built-in main memory and is installable as necessary. These recitations are clearly supported by at least paragraph [0016] of the specification.

Thus, applicants respectfully assert that, since the claims are supported by the

specification, the rejections of the claims are overcome.

Regarding the rejection of claim 45, it is noted that the language of this claim is clear on its face and that the language of the claim is supported by at least the illustration of FIG. 3 in the as filed disclosure. However, applicants have nonetheless amended the claim by removing the language cited by the Examiner as being problematic.

Thus, applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 45 is overcome.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Miyashita (U.S. Patent 6,244,894). This rejection is traversed.

Briefly, it is noted that claim 45 has been amended to recite that the fixed block and the slot, into which the detachable auxiliary memory card is removably inserted, are each positioned on the first side of the battery. This side of the battery is opposite to a side adjacent to the body of the electronic device. *See the position of the features identified by at least reference numerals 221, 221a and 222 in FIG. 2 for support and note that they are on a first side of the battery. Next, note that the first side is opposite the side adjacent to the electronic device. As such, the repair work and the replacement referred to in paragraph [0016] of the specification are facilitated.*

The reference to Miyashita, on the other hand, discloses that the IC card 30 is attached to the battery 20 at the first card mounting part 22, which is located on a surface of the battery 20 adjacent to the main body 10 of the cellular phone. Similarly, the PC card 40 is slid into the second card mounting part 23, which is located on the rear end of the battery. Thus, neither the IC card 30 nor the PC card 40 is attached to the battery 20 on the side of the battery 20 opposite to the side of the battery adjacent to the main body 10, as in the claimed invention.

Thus, claim 45 is believed to be patentably distinguished from the reference to Miyashita and that, therefore, the rejection of claim 45 is believed to be overcome.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 1-3, 7-10, 14-15, 17-18, 20, 22-24, 31-34, 38-39 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alberth et al (U.S. Patent 6,021,332) in view of Sawada et al (U.S. Patent 6,810,274). Claims 16 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

as being unpatentable over Alberth et al (U.S. Patent 6,021,332) in view of Sawada et al (U.S. Patent 6,810,274) and further in view of Wang (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0013506). Claims 6, 13 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alberth et al (U.S. Patent 6,021,332) in view of Sawada et al (U.S. Patent 6,810,274) and further in view of Miyashita (U.S. Patent 6,244,894). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alberth et al (U.S. Patent 6,021,332) in view of Sawada et al (U.S. Patent 6,810,274), in view of Austin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,590,303) and further in view of Griffith et al (U.S. Patent 6,917,280). Claims 11, 25-30 and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alberth et al (U.S. Patent 6,021,332) in view of Sawada et al (U.S. Patent 6,810,274), and further in view of Austin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,590,303). Claims 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0013506) in view of Sawada et al (U.S. Patent 6,810,274). These rejections are overcome.

Briefly, it is noted that claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 12, 15, 19, 20, 22, 26, 31 and 44 have been amended to recite that the claimed built-in main memory is detachable. This feature is supported by at least line 7 of paragraph [0016] of the specification and is not shown in any of the cited references.

For example, the memory 402 of Alberth has been cited as corresponding to the claimed built-in main memory. This memory, however, is not disclosed as being detachable in the reference. Rather, as shown in FIG. 4 and as described in column 6, lines 6-10 of Alberth, the main memory 402 is an integral part of the main battery 101 and does not appear to be removable from the main battery 101.

Thus, since the additionally cited references do not cure the defects of Alberth, applicants respectfully assert that the claims are patentably distinguished from the combination of the cited references and that, therefore, the rejections of the claims are believed to be overcome.

Regarding the rejections of the dependent claims, it is noted that the rejections of these claims are also believed to be overcome for at least the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited. If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Finally, if there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: _____

5/21/07

By: _____



Howard I. Levy
Registration No. 55,378

1400 Eye Street, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510